



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/674,279	09/29/2003	Wolfgang Hartung	117163.00090	3123
21334 7590 03/05/2009 HAHN LOESER & PARKS, LLP One GOJO Plaza Suite 300 AKRON, OH 44311-1076				
EXAMINER ALTER, ALYSSA MARGO				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3762				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
03/05/2009		ELECTRONIC		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patents@hahnlaw.com  
akron-docket@hotmail.com

# Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/674,279

**Applicant(s)**

HARTUNG, WOLFGANG

**Examiner**

Alyssa M. Alter

**Art Unit**

3762

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 November 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 6, 7, 11, 17, 18, 21, 22, 25 and 27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 6, 7, 11, 17, 18, 21, 22, 25 and 27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 02 July 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsman's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Priority***

Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-3, 6-7, 11, 17-18, 21-22, 25 and 27 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection necessitated by amendment.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

1. Claims 3, 11 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter, which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. As to claims 3 and 11, the specification does not provide support for "two or more floating atrial electrodes and two or more ventricular electrodes of said ventricular electrode line".

As to claim 27 the specification does not provide support for the "atrial wall electrode" and the "floating atrial electrodes" being "about the same physical size".

Art Unit: 3762

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

1. Claims 1-3, 6-7, 11, 17-18, 21-22, 25 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. It is unclear what the Applicant considers to be the "floating atrial electrode line". Additionally, it is unclear if the "at least one floating atrial electrode line" also possesses a floating atrial electrode in addition to the wall electrode.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claims 1-3, 6-7, 11, 17-18, 21-22, 25 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alt et al. (US 6,370,427 B1). Alt et al. discloses a pacing and defibrillation system. As seen in figure 4 the system includes an electrode line or lead 63 in the atrium with a wall electrode 64 and a floating electrode 62. Electrode 64, or the wall electrode, is used for sensing and pacing the cardiac activity of the atrium. Electrode 62, or the floating electrode, is used to provide a defibrillation shock to the heart. The wall electrode operates in a first mode by sensing and pacing the atrium of

the heart, while the floating electrode operates in a second mode to provide defibrillation stimulation. Additionally, figure 4 depicts a ventricular electrode line (VDD-electrode line) as lead 66. The lead also possesses a floating electrode 70.

Alt et al. discloses the device substantially as claimed except for placing a floating atrial electrode on the ventricular electrode line (VDD-electrode line). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the electrode lines and electrode placement to include a floating atrial electrode on the same line as a ventricular electrode since it has been held that forming in one piece an article which has formerly been formed in two pieces and put together involves only routine skill in the art. *Howard v. Detroit Stove Works*, 150 U.S. 164 (see MPEP 2144.04).

Furthermore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the lead electrodes since it was known in the art that such a modification to place multiple electrodes on one lead would provide the predictable results of reducing the quantity of invasive leads placed into the heart.

As to claims 3 and 11, Alt et al. discloses the claimed invention except for the two or more floating atrial electrodes and the two or more ventricular electrodes located on the ventricle electrode line. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include multiple electrodes on the electrode line, since it has been held that mere duplication of the essential working parts of a device involves only routine skill in the art. *St. Regis Paper Co. v. Bemis Co.*, 193 USPQ 8 (see MPEP 2144.04).

Furthermore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the lead electrodes since it was known in the art that such a modification to place multiple electrodes on one lead would provide the predictable results of reducing the quantity of invasive leads placed into the heart.

As to claims 2, 11, 21 and 25, Alt et al. discloses the claimed invention except for the high frequency stimulation with a cycle length of between 30-100 ms. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the cycle length of the stimulation by Alt et al., since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Aller*, 105 USPQ 233 (see MPEP 2144.05).

Furthermore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the cycle length since it was known in the art that such a modification to the cycle length would provide the predictable results of modifying the stimulation to meet specific patient therapy needs and requirements.

As to claims 6, 17-18, Alt et al. discloses the device the claimed invention except for the floating electrode performing as a sensor. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the defibrillation electrode with a sensing capabilities since it is well known in the art to use dual sensing and stimulating electrodes.

Furthermore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the electrodes since it was known in the art

that such a modification would provide the predictable results of additional sensing to ensure proper detection of cardiac fibrillation.

### ***Conclusion***

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alyssa M. Alter whose telephone number is (571)272-4939. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8am to 4pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Angela Sykes can be reached on (571) 272-4955. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/George R Evanisko/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3762

/Alyssa M Alter/  
Examiner  
Art Unit 3762